Exhibit B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 - - - X 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 18-CR-00681(WFK) 4 5 -against-: United States Courthouse 6 : Brooklyn, New York 7 Thursday, March 28, 2019 8 JEAN BOUSTANI, : 12:00 p.m. 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM FRANCIS KUNTZ, II 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 14 15 APPEARANCES: 16 For the Government: RICHARD P. DONOGHUE, ESQ. 17 United States Attorney Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East 18 Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: MATTHEW S. AMATRUDA, ESQ. 19 MARK E. BINI, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorneys 20 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 21 Criminal Division 1400 New York Avenue, NW 22 Suite 10424 Washington, DC 20005 23 MARGARET MOESER, ESQ. BY: DAVID M. FUHR, ÉSQ. 24 25

	Proceedings 2	
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)	
2		
3	For the Defendant: WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER. LLP	
4	For the Defendant: WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP 787 Seventh Avenue New York, New York 10019	
5	BY:RANDALL W. JACKSON, ESQ. MICHAEL S. SCHACHTER, ESQ.	
6	CASEY E. DONNELLY, ESQ.	
7		
8		
9	Court Reporter: Stacy A. Mace, RMR, CRR, RPR, CCR	
10	Official Court Reporter E-mail: SMaceRPR@gmail.com	
11	Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript produced by Computer-aided Transcription.	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	0000000	
17		
18		
19	(In open court.)	
20	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.	
21	(Judge WILLIAM F. KUNTZ, II entered the courtroom.)	
22	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The Honorable William F.	
23	Kuntz, II is now presiding.	
24	Criminal cause for status conference, docket number	
25	18-CR-681, USA versus Boustani, et al.	

	Proceedings 3
1	Counsel, please state your appearances for the
2	record and spell your first and your last names for the court
3	reporter.
4	(Defendant entered the courtroom.)
5	MR. AMATRUDA: Matthew Amatruda for the United
6	States. M-A-T-T-H-E-W, A-M-A-T-R-U-D-A.
7	Good afternoon, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Amatruda. You may
9	be seated.
10	MR. AMATRUDA: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	MR. BINI: Mark Bini for the United States, M-A-R-K,
12	B-I-N-I.
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Bini. You may be
14	seated.
15	MS. MOESER: Margaret Moeser for the United States.
16	M-A-R-G-A-R-E-T, M-O-E-S-E-R.
17	Good afternoon, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: You may be seated as well. Good
19	afternoon.
20	MR. FUHR: David Fuhr for the United States.
21	F-U-H-R. Good afternoon.
22	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. You may be seated.
23	SPECIAL AGENT TASSONE: Special Agent Angela Tassone
24	from the FBI. T-A-S-S-O-N-E.
25	THE COURT: And would you spell your name for the

	Proceedings 4
1	reporter:
2	SPECIAL AGENT TASSONE: T-A-S-S-O-N-E.
3	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Special Agent. You may
4	be seated.
5	SPECIAL AGENT TASSONE: Thank you.
6	SPECIAL AGENT HAQUE: Special Agent Fatima Haque
7	with the FBI. F-A-T-I-M-A, H-A-Q-U-E.
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Special Agent. You may
9	be seated.
10	MR. JACKSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Randall
11	Jackson on behalf of Mr. Boustani. That's R-A-N-D-A-L-L,
12	J-A-C-K-S-O-N.
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Jackson. You may be
14	seated.
15	MR. SCHACHTER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael
16	Schachter on behalf of Mr. Boustani. It's Michael,
17	M-I-C-H-A-E-L; Schachter, S-C-H-A-C-H-T-E-R.
18	THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated as
19	well.
20	THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jean
21	Boustani, J-E-A-N, B-O-U-S-T-A-N-I.
22	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Boustani. You may
23	be seated.
24	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
25	MS. DONNELLY: And I'm Casey Donnelly on behalf of

Proceedings 5 Mr. Boustani, C-A-S-E-Y, D-O-N-N-E-L-L-Y. 1 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated as 3 well. Thank you. 4 We are here for a status conference in this action, United States versus Boustani, 18-CR-681. The defendant, 5 Mr. Boustani, who is present here today, is currently in 6 7 custody. 8 The background is as follows: 9 On December 18th of 2018 a grand jury of the United States of America returned a four-count indictment against 10 11 this defendant and others charging: 12 Conspiracy to commit wire fraud in violation of 13 Title 18 United States Code Section 1349; 14 Conspiracy to commit securities fraud in 2. violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 371; 15 16 Conspiracy to violate the FCPA anti-bribery and 17 internal controls provisions in violation of Title 18 United 18 States Code Section 371; and 19 Conspiracy to commit money laundering in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 1956(h). 20 21 This defendant is charged with Counts 1, 2 and 4. 22 The indictment avers this defendant created, with 23 others, maritime projects as fronts to raise money to enrich 24 themselves and diverted, with others, portions of loan 25 proceeds to pay at least \$20 million in bribes and kickbacks

to themselves, government officials in and of Mozambique, and others.

On January 2nd of 2019, this defendant was arraigned on the indictment before the Honorable Magistrate Judge Peggy Kuo and the defendant pled not guilty to all charges set forth in all counts. Denying the defendant's first bail application, Magistrate Judge Kuo ordered detention, but granted the defendant leave to renew his bail application.

On January 8th of 2019 the defense appealed the order of detention to this court.

On January 22nd of 2019 this Court held its first status conference in this case. The United States Government reported it produced its first round of Rule 16 discovery, including one million pages and bank records identifying what it claimed were illegal transactions and expected and anticipated it would be able to provide and would provide additional discovery on or before February 1st of 2019. The Court designated the case complex and entered an order of excludable delay. The Court then heard oral argument on the appeal of detention. The Court reserved decision, and on February 4th of 2019 this Court denied the defendant's motion appealing the order of detention.

The defendant subsequently appealed that order to the United States Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit.

On February 7th of 2019 this Court held its second

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

7

status conference in this case. First, the Government reported it had already produced and anticipated producing hundreds of thousands of documents to complete its Rule 16 discovery obligations on or before March 31st of 2019. Secondly, the Government discussed its progress on extraditing the other defendants in this case. The Government submitted defendant Manuel Chang, C-H-A-N-G, to his formal extradition to the South African government, which was expected to be discussed at Defendant Chang's hearing on February 26th of 2019. The Government also stated it did not know when the extradition process in the United Kingdom would conclude. Defense counsel advised the Court that it might take up to three years for the defendants to be extradited from the United Kingdom and there is the possibility Defendant Chang will never be extradited from South Africa. However, as the United States Government conceded, at this point there are no other defendants and the Government is prepared to proceed without them.

The Court will commence trial of this action on Monday, October 7th of 2019 at 9:30 a.m. in this courtroom. Counsel should calendar that date and that time.

Finally, the defense counsel informed the Court that he requested search items from the Government, that the Government had failed to produce documents to the defense.

The Court ordered the parties to submit a joint briefing

Proceedings

schedule on the search terms in the event the parties failed to reach an agreement on that issue. Time was excluded in the interest of justice to today's date, March 28th of 2019.

In a letter to the Court dated February 28th of 2019 the parties reported that they had resolved their issues regarding the search terms. The Government filed letters on March 12th, 2019 and March 19th, 2019, March 21st of 2019 and March 27th of 2019 stating it had produced additional Rule 16 discovery and requested reciprocal discovery from the defendant.

On March 7th of 2019 the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit unanimously affirmed this Court's order on the defendant's appeal of detention and denied the defendant's appeal without prejudice to present a further bail application before this Court in the first instance. The Second Circuit noted in the event the defendant presents an amended bail package, the Government shall continue to bear the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that, one, the defendant presents an actual risk of flight; and two, that no condition or combination of conditions could be imposed that would reasonably assure his presence in court.

On March 19th of 2019 defense counsel submitted an amended bail package that includes the conditions described in the initial bail application and proposes additional or

amended items as follows:

- 1. A \$20 million personal recognizance bond secured by a \$2 million in cash position from personal accounts and \$7 million in cash posted by defendant's father; amounting to 75 percent of the combined cash assets of the defendant and his father:
- 2. A waiver of extradition relinquishing his rights to fight extradition to the United States from anywhere in the world;
- 3. The advancement of a year's worth of fees to Guidepost or any private security firm designated by the Government; and
- 4. An agreement to revisit the bail package in the event the defendant's co-defendants cannot afford private security as a condition of release.

Defense counsel also argues the Government's case against the defendant is "substantially flawed" because the indictment impermissibly applies wire fraud and securities fraud statutes to reach extraterritorial conduct lacking a sufficient domestic nexus. The defense asserts the securities fraud statute does not extend to foreign securities trades executed on foreign exchanges, even if purchased or sold by American investors and even if some aspects of the transaction occurred in the United States. According to defense counsel, in order to properly allege a domestic application of the wire

Proceedings

fraud statute, the Government must show defendant committed a substantial portion of the conduct in the United States of America and that the conduct in the United States of America was integral to the commission of the scheme to defraud. Relying on the use of domestic wires is simply not enough. See the renewed application for bail at ECF number 54.

On March 26th of 2019 the Government filed its response in opposition to the defendant's renewed bail application. The Government averred defendant remained a flight risk and asserts the amended bail application fails to assure reasonably his appearance for the following reasons:

First, the amount of cash offered to secure his bond stems from the charged criminal scheme, the source of funds, as was questioned and raised by Judge Raggi of the Second Circuit in the oral argument of the appeal.

Secondly, the waiver of extradition would have no practical or binding effect because a waiver of extradition does not compel the nation in which the defendant would find himself to honor the waiver.

Third, the defendant's offer to advance a year's worth of fees to Guidepost or any other security firm designated by the Government would not alleviate the inherent conflict of interest faced by private jailers paid by the defendant or his employer who might be called upon to exert force, perhaps up to and including deadly force, to stop the

defendant from an attempted escape.

Fourth, the agreement to revisit his proposed bail conditions in the event his co-defendants were extradited to the United States and detained upon the basis that they could not afford private security would not prevent this defendant from fleeing before any of his co-defendants arrived, should that ever be the case.

The Government further argues its application of the wire fraud and securities statutes is domestic. In its view, the Government actors, including the Securities Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice, have extraterritorial jurisdiction analogous to 304 jurisdiction of bankruptcy courts over securities fraud violations where significant conduct or foreseeable effects occur in the United States of America. Moreover, the conspiracy charged is domestic because it encompasses purchases of loan participation notes and bonds by investors physically present in the United States.

Finally, the Government argues the focus of the wire fraud statute in the use of wires, which in this case occurred domestically in the United States and in New York City. The Government concludes that no combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance in future court proceedings.

Last evening the Court received, by way of ECF

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

Proceedings

filing, an eight-page letter from defense counsel. The letter makes the following points:

First, it alleges that the posting of a majority of Mr. Boustani's and his father's assets provides sufficient moral suasion to ensure Mr. Boustani's appearance. Some people don't think morality is what counts, it's getting caught is what counts, but here we have the assertion of moral suasion.

In any event, on page 3 of the letter, again, the word moral force is used. It says midway through the first full paragraph: It is hard to imagine a moral force more compelling on Mr. Boustani than harm to those he loves most in the world.

Page 3 also says further down that Mr. Boustani presumed innocent; quite so. But it also states his earnings from his lawful employment should be presumed to be legitimate funds. That is not the position asserted by my learned Second Circuit colleague Judge Raggi. Because while it may or may not be the issue, Judge Raggi made it clear at the oral argument that the source of funds is an issue in this case that is of importance to her and to the judges on the Second Circuit who heard this case. And as Judge Carney opined at the time of the oral argument, it is clear that the question of flight risk has not been sufficiently addressed to the satisfaction of the Second Circuit at the time of the argument

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

to the Second Circuit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second point in the letter that came in last night from the Willkie Farr law firm is the Government's objections to Mr. Boustani's other additional conditions do not satisfy its burden of proving that no conditions will reasonably ensure Mr. Boustani's appearance. And, again, they pick on the issue of the waiver of extradition. And, again, the issue is the issue that was raised in response by the Government as to whether or not a mere waiver by an individual compels a government that does not have extradition with the United States to extradite a citizen. And as the Government pointed out, undoubtedly, the waiver that is executed here would at the time, if one was in a country and did not want to be extradited from that country, the argument would be made that the waiver was done under compulsion. And in any event, nations that decline to have extradition treaties with the United States of America would certainly not be bound by any signed document by this defendant.

Next is the statement that Mr. Boustani's challenge to the indictments are not frivolous and militate in favor of granting bail. Obviously, subject matter jurisdiction cannot be conferred to a limited jurisdiction court, such as this district court, as an Article III court. And the question of whether or not there is subject matter jurisdiction is certainly one that this Court will address. There has,

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

Proceedings

obviously, been an alleged statement by the defendant with respect to subject matter jurisdiction and the ubiquity of the great American dollar worldwide. The reality is that either this Court has subject matter jurisdiction as a matter of law or it does not. But in any event, those are issues that I am sure will be briefed before this Court and will be decided before this Court.

So the trial is going to commence in this action at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, October 7th of this year. We will pick the jury here. We will go directly to trial. The amended bail application is denied. It is not sufficient. This defendant is still a flight risk. I am not approving it. The defendant has not satisfied the moral issue, does not persuade the Court, as is asserted by the Willkie Farr firm, and I do not believe that putting people in countries that do not have extradition with the United States in any way, shape or form ensures that they will appear for trial.

Obviously, the Willkie Farr firm is absolutely free to take an appeal, as they did before, with respect to this, but I think the issues are important. I think it is clear that this defendant continues to be a flight risk. I do not think that the issues were adequately addressed, and I am not persuaded by the moral suasion arguments that have come forward by the Willkie Farr law firm in this case.

So having said that, I will now hear from the

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

Government, then I will hear from defense counsel.

MR. AMATRUDA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just to give -- I will give the Court an update on two matters; one is discovery in the case. The second are the extradition proceedings related to the other defendants.

With respect to discovery, we have substantively completed discovery in this case. We produced what now amounts to approximately 5 million pages of documents, that translates into a million actual records. Some of the records are multiple pages. That discovery includes e-mail accounts, personal e-mail accounts on which the Government executed search warrants, documents from victims, documents from third-party witnesses, as well as from the investment banks that arranged the underlying transactions.

Of course, our discovery obligations we understand are ongoing. And to that effect, we continue to scrub our files to triple and quadruple check that we have produced everything we are required to. Obviously, if we have other documents that we did not produce earlier that we realize we should have, we will get those out right away.

There are a few, some categories or some documents that continue to come in that somebody received in the interim between the last two status conferences, and there may very well be more that we receive in the interim and we will move to produce those documents expeditiously and get those to

Proceedings 16 defense right away. 1 2 The last category is that there are some documents 3 that were tied up in privilege analysis in a filter process. 4 Obviously, the e-mail accounts, the personal e-mail accounts we have contained some documents that were arguably 5 communications between the e-mail holders and their counsel, 6 7 and we have instituted a filter process. And we are -- as we 8 get documents that are cleared through that filter process, we 9 are producing them as well. 10 THE COURT: Do you have a separate taint team or are the same lawyers reviewing for privilege as are trying the 11 12 case? 13 MR. AMATRUDA: Thank you for clarifying, Your Honor. 14 There is a separate taint team who review those materials. 15 That's important. Go ahead. THE COURT: 16 MR. AMATRUDA: So that is the status of discovery, 17 but I would like to emphasize that my latter points are simply 18 to say that inevitably there are things that we find, there 19 are things that come up that we will produce expeditiously, 20 but substantively in terms of the discovery in this case, 21 we're done. We've produced -- we've produced with those, I

So with respect to the extradition proceedings, the defendant Manuel Chang remains detained in South Africa.

think, minor exceptions, we produced everything and the most

significant records that we're aware of.

22

23

24

25

	Proceedings 17
1	There is a hearing on April 8th to consider the merits of our
2	extradition request. We are hoping, obviously, that we will
3	get a ruling quickly. Procedurally after that we understand
4	there is another step to this that I am not we don't know
5	how long it will take, but that's where things stand with
6	that.
7	THE COURT: That's separate and apart, though; as
8	you said earlier, you are ready to go to trial on this case?
9	MR. AMATRUDA: Yes, Judge.
10	THE COURT: You will be ready to go on October 7th?
11	MR. AMATRUDA: That's exactly right, Judge. We are
12	ready to proceed. We will be you know, we will be here
13	April 7th I'm sorry, we will be here April 7th if the Court
14	wants us to be.
15	THE COURT: October 7th.
16	MR. AMATRUDA: We will be here October 7th. But if
17	Mr. Chang shows up tomorrow, certainly we may ask the Court to
18	consider that, but we are not asking the Court to delay the
19	proceedings while we wait for extradition.
20	THE COURT: That's good because the Court will not
21	do that.
22	MR. AMATRUDA: And that certainly is what we would
23	expect, Your Honor. We appreciate that. And we are not
24	we're not going to go there.
25	So in terms of the proceedings in the United

Proceedings 18 1 Kingdom, the defendants have appeared. We have filed our 2 extradition papers. They've appeared. There is the 3 proceedings or litigation that goes on with those, but as the 4 Court has said, the defense counsel has made clear we don't know how long that's going to take. Hopefully, it will be 5 6 fast, but --7 THE COURT: That's what they said about Brexit, so 8 you never know. 9 MR. AMATRUDA: Yes, they have other things going on 10 over there, but we will keep the Court informed. And we will 11 move forward in the interim with this case and, as I made 12 clear, we are ready to go forward with Mr. Boustani. 13 I think that is -- those are the only things that I 14 wanted to raise with the Court. 15 I will urge the parties to put in a THE COURT: 16 briefing motion schedule. If you cannot do it consensually, I 17 Now that you know the trial date, I think will impose one. 18 you should work with defense counsel against a backdrop that 19 indicates if there are going to be motions to suppress or 20 other motions that need to be decided, and obviously you will 21 comply with the Court's individual rules for criminal trials, 22 but I just wanted to get you thinking about that sooner rather 23 than later. All right? 24 MR. AMATRUDA: Yes, and that's fine, Your Honor. 25 We've been able to work with defense counsel productively in

19 Proceedings 1 the past with regard to these things. 2 THE COURT: Good. 3 MR. AMATRUDA: I can't imagine that we're going to 4 have any issues figuring out a motion schedule. THE COURT: Thank you. 5 I will hear from defense counsel. 6 7 MR. SCHACHTER: Your Honor, with respect to the 8 trial date --9 THE COURT: I'm sorry, would you just speak into the 10 microphone? 11 MR. SCHACHTER: I'm sorry, yes, Your Honor. 12 With respect to the trial dates, I have a couple of 13 conflicts. 14 THE COURT: I am sorry to hear that, but you know, you are the ones who said you wanted to go to trial sooner 15 16 rather than later. And I can ask the Government if they want 17 to go to trial sooner than October the 7th, but your 18 colleague, Mr. Jackson, talked about needing to get experts 19 and moving people in from around the world, so I thought 20 October 7th was a date that is far enough in the future for 21 you to prepare your defense adequately and for the prosecution 22 to go forward. But if you want to start talking about August 23 dates, we can talk about August dates. 24 Would that be better for you? 25 MR. SCHACHTER: It would, Your Honor.

in August?

Proceedings

THE COURT: Do you want to go to trial on this case

MR. AMATRUDA: Judge, I -- we certainly would be ready whenever the Court would set the trial date. However, what I would say is that we would anticipate having some legitimate difficulty with witnesses in the middle of August obtaining their appearance. Certainly, we'll be ready to go whenever the Court sets.

THE COURT: All right, well, I am going to stick with October the 7th, but I will hear from defense counsel about your scheduling problems.

MR. SCHACHTER: Thank you, Your Honor, and I apologize for needing to note this.

I have a criminal trial scheduled before Judge Engelmayer on September 22nd that has already been scheduled, as well as a criminal trial before Judge Koeltl on -- that's scheduled for October the 25th. And if it wasn't for set criminal trial dates, believe me, Your Honor, I would not have even mentioned them.

THE COURT: Well, now you have another set criminal trial date and my colleagues, Paul Engelmayer is a fine fellow and I'm sure my colleague John Koeltl on the other side of the harbor will understand that you cannot be there and certainly the jury will understand that you can't be here during certain parts the trial.

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

Proceedings

MR. SCHACHTER: So in light of those other trial dates, Your Honor, and in light of the Government's representation that it is ready for trial whenever the Court sets it, we would ask if Your Honor could consider an earlier trial date.

There are things to do in this case, but particularly given Mr. Boustani's detention, we are anxious to go to trial as swiftly as is humanly possible.

And so we understand that Your Honor has a crowded schedule, but it would be our request that the Court set a date, even if -- we certainly understand the Government's concerns about witnesses' availability in August.

THE COURT: Well, I will tell you what we will do, right now I am setting it for Monday, October 7th at 9:30 a.m., pick and go. If you and the Government want to come in with a consensual request for a different trial date, you can submit that on ECF and I will take it under advisement.

I have the power to move my cases around, just as Engelmayer and Koeltl have the power to move their cases around. So, Moses came down with ten things on the tablet; our trial calendars, despite our enormous Article III egos, were not on it. So, there you go.

MR. SCHACHTER: I appreciate that, Your Honor.
We'll confer with the Government. I just face three judges
who each have the power to incarcerate me.

SAM OCR RMR CRR RPR

Proceedings 22 And which are just great friends, but 1 THE COURT: 2 you have those sort of back-to-school scheduling issues. I 3 get it, okay, go ahead. 4 MR. SCHACHTER: That's all with respect to trial 5 dates. THE COURT: 6 Okay. 7 Again, good afternoon, Your Honor. MR. JACKSON: 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 9 MR. JACKSON: Just to note a couple of things. 10 One, first Mr. Amatruda is absolutely correct, we are confident that we can work with the Government in crafting 11 12 an appropriate briefing schedule that will be helpful to the 13 Court. 14 THE COURT: You handled those search term issues very well, and I appreciate you doing that. 15 16 MR. JACKSON: We appreciate that, Your Honor. 17 I do want to raise with the Court that I anticipate 18 discussing with the Government an earlier schedule for some of 19 the productions that we typically make before trial than would 20 occur in some of the simpler trials that the Court deals with 21 because the last thing that we want is for the Court to have a 22 raft of extraordinarily complex motions on the eve of trial. 23 So we anticipate that one of the issues we'll be discussing 24 with the Government is early production of 3500 material and

exhibits so that we can file timely motions in limine.

We know that the Court, Your Honor's individual rules for typical trials allows for motions in limine shortly before trial, only ten days before, but we think that getting out ahead of what we anticipate will be some significant evidentiary issues and giving the Court adequate time will be a better use of everyone's resources.

THE COURT: I appreciate that.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Also wanted to flag that there are -- the Government has been diligently moving through their rolling discovery. There is a substantial amount of discovery that we've only recently received, at least several hundred-thousand pages of documents that we've gotten relatively recently, and one statement that the Government identified as having been made by Mr. Boustani that was delivered to us, I believe, just yesterday.

THE COURT: I saw that statement and as I averred, it seemed to have more to do with subject matter jurisdiction than personal jurisdiction. So whether the statement was made or not made, the reality is subject matter jurisdiction does not depend on a statement made by an individual other than the United States Supreme Court justices, Court of Appeals justices, and occasionally District Court justices.

 $\label{eq:solution} \text{So I mean I read it, it is what it is, but it is no} \\ \\ \text{more than what it is --}$

Proceedings 24 1 MR. JACKSON: Absolutely, Judge. 2 THE COURT: -- when it comes to subject matter 3 jurisdiction anyway. 4 MR. JACKSON: That makes sense, Judge. Wanted to just flag that. 5 6 THE COURT: Consider it flagged. 7 MR. JACKSON: Yes, and we'll be discussing with them 8 sort of the schedule for additional motions. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. SCHACHTER: And then, Your Honor, just one more question about our conferring with the Government regarding 11 12 potential or earlier trial dates to see if they will be 13 amenable to a joint proposal on that. 14 Would it be helpful if we conferred with Your Honor's Courtroom Deputy? 15 16 THE COURT: No, I think in this case because there 17 are so many moving parts, we have a number of criminal matters 18 that are also vying for the Court's time, and not to say that 19 Social Security appeals, habeas corpus cases, Fair Labor 20 Standard Act cases, Fair Debt Collection Practice Act action 21 cases are not important, and not to say that it has anything 22 to do with the fact that there were four colleagues who were 23 put forward for appointment to the District Court and that 24 Judge Bianco has been approved for the Second Circuit, that 25 has nothing to do with what we are talking about here.

Proceedings 25 MR. SCHACHTER: Yes, Your Honor. All right, we'll 1 2 confer with the Government and we'll submit something. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Anything else? MR. AMATRUDA: Judge, I know that Your Honor will 5 6 get to this, but we would respectfully ask the Court to enter 7 an order excluding the time between now and trial. 8 THE COURT: We will do that, and Mr. Jackson will 9 circulate that order. Hopefully, all counsel and parties will 10 sign it, but in any event, even if they do not, I have already 11 deemed it a complex trial and I will exclude time in the 12 interest of justice through and including October 7th of 2019. 13 I would hope that the parties and counsel will sign it, but if they do not, if they don't want to say this is a 14 15 complex case despite millions of documents and dozens of 16 witnesses and international issues, then that is the position 17 they can take. 18 Anything else? MR. AMATRUDA: No; thank you, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Anything else from defense counsel? 21 MR. JACKSON: No, Your Honor; thank you. 22 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Jackson, would you 23 circulate the proposed order excluding time in the interest of 24 justice in this case through and including October 7th of 25 2019, so if we can have a sign-off from counsel?

	Proceedings 26
1	MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, we have at this point
2	we are not in a position to waive our client's speedy trial.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. JACKSON: Thank you.
5	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Here you are, Judge.
6	THE COURT: I have what has been marked as Court 1
7	for identification, a waiver of speedy trial and order of
8	excludable delay in the interest of justice excluding time in
9	this case from today's date, March 28th of 2019, to and
10	including October 7th of 2019.
11	The proposed order has been signed by the Assistant
12	United States Attorney, Mr. Amatruda, the defendant has
13	declined to sign it and defense counsel has declined to sign
14	it. I am signing it and admitting it into evidence as Court
15	1, and time in this case, it is clearly a complex case, is
16	excluded until October 7th, of 2019 when we will pick our jury
17	and go to trial.
18	Anything else I can help counsel with today?
19	Mr. Jackson, here is Court 1 in evidence.
20	(Court's Exhibit 1 was received in evidence.)
21	THE COURT: Anything else?
22	MR. AMATRUDA: No; thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Anything else?
24	MR. JACKSON: No; thank you, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Thank you. We are adjourned.